

BRANE GASES ON K3 AND CALABI-YAU MANIFOLDS

Damien A. Easson

*Physics Department, McGill University,
3600 University Street, Montréal, Québec, H3A 2T8, CANADA*

February 7, 2008

Abstract

We initiate the study of Brane Gas Cosmology (BGC) on manifolds with non-trivial holonomy. Such compactifications are required within the context of superstring theory in order to make connections with realistic particle physics. We study the dynamics of brane gases constructed from various string theories on background spaces having a K3 submanifold. The K3 compactifications provide a stepping stone for generalising the model to the case of a full Calabi-Yau three-fold. Duality symmetries are discussed within a cosmological context. Using a duality, we arrive at an $N=2$ theory in four-dimensions compactified on a Calabi-Yau manifold with $SU(3)$ holonomy. We argue that the Brane Gas model compactified on such spaces maintains the successes of the trivial toroidal compactification while greatly enhancing its connection to particle physics. The initial state of the universe is taken to be a small, hot and dense gas of p-branes near thermal equilibrium. The universe has no initial singularity and the dynamics of string winding modes allow three spatial dimensions to grow large, providing a possible solution to the dimensionality problem of string theory.

PACS numbers: 04.50+h; 11.25.Mj; 98.80.Bp; 98.80.Cq.

E-mail: easson@hep.physics.mcgill.ca

arXiv: [hep-th/0110225](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/0110225)

1 Introduction

The goal of this paper is to deepen the connection between the Brane Gas Cosmology (BGC) presented in [1, 2] and realistic models of particle physics derived from superstring theory. The BGC model employs the Brandenberger-Vafa mechanism of [3], in an attempt to understand the origin of our large $(3+1)$ -dimensional universe, while simultaneously resolving the initial singularity problem of standard Big Bang cosmology.

Although we have been relatively successful in keeping with these ambitions, the price we pay is that we have made little connection with realistic particle physics. Part of this problem arises from the toroidal compactification of superstring theory used in [1]. It is well known that compactifications of superstrings on manifolds of trivial holonomy cannot produce realistic models of particle physics.

The original setting for the BGC model was within Type IIA string theory. In this paper we present modifications of BGC by studying the model within the context of other branches of the M -theory moduli space. We consider the physics of the resulting p -brane gases on manifolds with non-trivial holonomy. In particular, we focus our attention on a manifold with a $K3$ subspace. Such compactifications are of interest for numerous reasons, as we shall see below. For one, it seems that the mathematics of $K3$ is intimately connected to the heterotic string, which is the superstring theory that is most easily related to realistic particle physics.

We use the fact that a certain string theory compactified on $K3 \times \mathbf{T}^2$ can be related via duality to another string theory on a Calabi-Yau three-fold with $SU(3)$ holonomy. The general results of [1] remain intact. Using the rich properties of $K3$ surfaces and the dualities which (with strings) tie together the various branches of the M -theory moduli space, we come ever closer to the construction of a potentially realistic model of the universe.

Of course, the only physically relevant case is that of an $\mathcal{N} = 1$ theory in four dimensions. Unfortunately, we do not produce such a theory here! However, some of the models presented in this paper provide a significant improvement to the toroidal compactifications of [1]. We provide an

existence proof of a brane gas cosmology with an $\mathcal{N} = 2$ theory in four dimensions compactified on a Calabi-Yau three-fold with $SU(3)$ holonomy. Despite the lack of one-cycles in such spaces there are cases where only three spatial dimensions can become large. It is our hope that such theories may provide clues to the behavior of more realistic, $\mathcal{N} = 1$ models.

The brane gas model solves the dimensionality problem, possibly revealing the origin of our four-dimensional universe. The model also solves the initial singularity and horizon problem of the standard Big Bang cosmology without relying on an inflationary phase. Note that we do not exclude the possibility of an inflationary phase (perhaps along the lines of the string-inspired inflationary models of [4] - [7]) during some stage in the evolution of the universe.

The presentation of this paper is as follows. Section 1.1 introduces the dimensionality problem as a problem for both string theory and cosmology. We discuss the fact that eleven-dimensional supergravity places an upper bound on the number of spatial dimensions in our universe and introduce the model of Brane Gas Cosmology in section 1.2 in an attempt to explain why we live in a three-dimensional world. Section 2 introduces the first steps toward generalising the model of Brane Gas Cosmology to manifolds with nontrivial holonomy. Various scenarios are constructed from different branches of the M -theory moduli space and in different background topologies. We then attempt to relate the different constructions via dualities. We argue that these cosmological scenarios provide further evidence for the conjectured dualities. Some final thoughts are presented in section 3.

1.1 The Dimensionality Problem

Arguably, one of the most significant dilemmas in string theory is the dimensionality problem. A consistent formulation of superstring theory requires the universe to be $(9 + 1)$ -dimensional but empirical evidence demonstrates that the universe is $(3 + 1)$ -dimensional.

One resolution to this apparent conflict is to hypothesise that six of the spatial dimensions are curled up on a near Planckian sized manifold, and are therefore difficult to detect in the low energy world that we live in. But if this is the case, the question naturally arises, why is there a difference in

size and structure between our large 3-dimensional universe and the 6-dimensional compact space? What physical laws demand that spacetime be split in such a seemingly unusual way? Since we are assuming superstring theory is the correct theory to describe the physical universe, the answer to these questions must come from within the theory itself.

Although the dimensionality problem is a very severe problem from a cosmological viewpoint it is rarely addressed. For example, brane world cosmological models derived from string theories typically impose the identification of our universe with a 3-brane. All current formulations fail to explain why our universe is a d -brane of spatial dimension $d = 3$, opposed to any other value of d , and furthermore fail to explain why our universe is this particular 3-brane opposed to any other 3-brane which may appear in the theory. Due to the current unnatural construction of such models, it seems possible that they will inevitably require some form of the anthropic principle in order to address the dimensionality problem.

The dimensionality problem is not unique to string theory, however; it is an equally challenging problem for cosmology. A truly complete cosmological model (if it is possible to obtain such a thing), whether derived from M -theory, quantum gravity or any other theory, should necessarily explain why we live in $(3 + 1)$ -dimensions.

Because this conundrum is an integral part of both superstring theory and cosmology, it seems likely that only an amalgamation of the two will be capable of producing a satisfactory solution. After all, if one is going to evolve from a 9-dimensional space to a 3-dimensional space, one is going to require dynamics, and the dynamics of our universe are governed by cosmology.

1.2 Brane Gas Cosmology

The search for an explanation of spacetime structure and dimensionality is not completely hopeless. It is possible to show that the largest dimension in which one can construct a supergravity theory is in $D = 11$, thus providing an upper limit on the number of spacetime dimensions [8].¹ Eleven dimensional supergravity is of particular interest since it has been identified as the low energy limit

¹By a supergravity theory we mean a theory containing particles with a maximum spin of 2.

of M -theory [11, 12]. Because of this conjecture the theory provides an ideal starting point for the construction of an M -cosmology.

Eleven dimensional supergravity contains only three fields: the vielbein e_M^A (or equivalently the graviton G_{MN}), a Majorana gravitino ψ_M and a three-form potential A_{MNP} . Here the indices are eleven-valued. In order to have equal numbers of bosonic and fermionic fields one must have the following number of degrees of freedom for each of these fields: $e_M^A = 44$ components, $\psi_M = 128$ components and $A_{MNP} = 84$ components (see, for example [9]). The full Lagrangian for this theory was first written down by Cremmer, Julia and Scherk in [13] and will serve as our starting point:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} = & -\frac{1}{2\kappa^2}eR - \frac{1}{2}e\bar{\psi}_M\Gamma^{MNP}D_N\left(\frac{1}{2}(\omega + \hat{\omega})\right)\psi_P - \frac{1}{48}eF_{MNPQ}^2 \\ & - \frac{\sqrt{2}\kappa}{384}e\left(\bar{\psi}_M\Gamma^{MNPQRS}\psi_S + 12\bar{\psi}^N\Gamma^{PQ}\psi^R\right)(F + \hat{F})_{NPQR} \\ & - \frac{\sqrt{2}\kappa}{3456}\epsilon^{M_1\cdots M_{11}}F_{M_1\cdots M_4}F_{M_5\cdots M_8}A_{M_9M_{10}M_{11}}. \end{aligned} \quad (1.1)$$

Here F_{MNPQ} is the curl (field strength) of A_{MNP} and $\hat{F}_{MNPQ}$ is the supercovariant F_{MNPQ} . The spin connection is ω_{MAB} and is given by the solution to the field equation that results from varying it as an independent field. $\hat{\omega}_{MAB}$ is the supercovariant connection given by

$$\hat{\omega}_{MAB} = \omega_{MAB} + \frac{1}{8}\bar{\psi}^P\Gamma_{PMABQ}\psi^Q. \quad (1.2)$$

The Γ 's in equation (1.1) are antisymmetrized products with unit weight,

$$\Gamma^{AB} = \frac{1}{2}(\Gamma^A\Gamma^B - \Gamma^B\Gamma^A), \quad (1.3)$$

where $\Gamma^M = e_A^M\Gamma^A$ are the Dirac matrices which obey $\{\Gamma^A, \Gamma^B\} = 2\eta_{AB}$.

The corresponding super-algebra in terms of the central charges Z is

$$\{Q_\alpha, Q_\beta\} = (\Gamma^M C)_{\alpha\beta} P_M + (\Gamma^{MN} C)_{\alpha\beta} Z_{MN} + (\Gamma^{MNPQR} C)_{\alpha\beta} Z_{MNPQR}, \quad (1.4)$$

where each central charge term on the right corresponds to a p -brane. The Q_γ are the supersymmetry generators and the C matrices are real antisymmetric matrices [20]. This action will be the starting point for the model of Brane Gas Cosmology presented below. As we have already

mentioned, supergravity seems to place an upper limit on the number of spacetime dimensions in our universe. Other considerations which involve dynamical processes may in fact tell us why we are living in three spatial dimensions. In addition to eleven-dimensional $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supergravity, the moduli space of M -theory also contains the five consistent superstring theories. Because all of these theories are on equal footing (from a mathematical perspective), it is likely that valuable information may be gained by considering string cosmology in every branch of the M -theory moduli space. We will explore several such avenues and find interesting relations between them via the conjectured web of dualities which link the various branches of the M -moduli space. It is possible that cosmological considerations will provide clues as to why the M -theory uni-verse is fragmented into the superstring penta-verse, leading to deeper insight into the nature of duality symmetries.

Recently, a new way to incorporate M -theory into cosmology was introduced in [1]. The motivations for this scenario, are the problems of the standard Big Bang model (such as the presence of an initial singularity), the problems of string theory (such as the dimensionality problem), and are cosmological. By cosmological we mean that we wish to stay in close contact with the standard Big Bang model, and therefore maintain the initial conditions of a hot, small and dense universe. In our opinion, many other attempts to incorporate M -theory into cosmology, such as the existing formulations of brane world scenarios, are often motivated from particle physics and make little connection with what we know about the origins of the universe. They also suffer from the dimensionality problem mentioned above. Why do the extra dimensions have the topologies they do? Why should a 3-brane be favored over any other p -brane for our universe, and why should we live on one particular 3-three brane versus another?

Besides keeping close ties with our beloved Big Bang cosmology we want to derive our model from the fundamental theory of everything, namely M -theory. The difficulty here is that we don't know what M -theory is. We will therefore start with what we do know, the conjectured low energy limit of M -theory, which is the eleven-dimensional, $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supergravity given by the action (1.1). Dimensional reduction of this theory on $\mathbf{S}^1$ results in Type IIA, $D = 10$ supergravity which is the low energy limit of Type IIA superstring theory. The overall spatial manifold was assumed to be

toroidal in all nine spatial dimensions. The bosonic part of the low energy effective action for the background spacetime is

$$S_{NS} = \frac{1}{2\kappa^2} \int d^{10}x \sqrt{-G} e^{-2\Phi} [R + 4G^{\mu\nu} \nabla_\mu \Phi \nabla_\nu \Phi - \frac{1}{12} H_{\mu\nu\alpha} H^{\mu\nu\alpha}], \quad (1.5)$$

where we have included the Neveu-Schwarz - Neveu-Schwarz (NS-NS) fields only, and ignored the terms bilinear in Ramond - Ramond (RR) fields. Here G is the determinant of the background metric $G_{\mu\nu}$, Φ is the dilaton, H denotes the field strength corresponding to the bulk antisymmetric tensor field $B_{\mu\nu}$, and κ is determined by the 10-dimensional Newton constant.

The supersymmetry algebra for the Type IIA theory is obtained by dimensional reduction of the eleven-dimensional super-algebra of equation (1.4) and is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \{Q_\alpha, Q_\beta\} = & (\Gamma^M C)_{\alpha\beta} P_M + (\Gamma_{11} C)_{\alpha\beta} Z + (\Gamma^M \Gamma_{11} C)_{\alpha\beta} Z_M + (\Gamma^{MN} C)_{\alpha\beta} Z_{MN} \\ & + (\Gamma^{MNPQ} \Gamma_{11} C)_{\alpha\beta} Z_{MNPQ} + (\Gamma^{MNPQR} C)_{\alpha\beta} Z_{MNPQR}. \end{aligned} \quad (1.6)$$

The universe is assumed to be filled with a gas of the p -branes contained in the spectrum of this theory. Furthermore, the torus is assumed to start out small (string length scale) and with all fundamental degrees of freedom near thermal equilibrium. M -theory contains a 3-form tensor gauge field $B_{\mu\nu\rho}$ which corresponds to an electrically charged supermembrane (the $M2$ -brane). The $M5$ -brane is a magnetically charged object. M -theory also contains the graviton (see, for example [14]). The $M2$ -brane and $M5$ -brane can wrap around the $\mathbf{S}^1$ in the compactification down to ten-dimensions, and hence produce the fundamental string and the $D4$ -brane of the Type IIA theory, respectively. If the $M2$ and $M5$ branes do not wrap on the $\mathbf{S}^1$ they produce the $D2$ and 5-brane solutions in the IIA theory. The graviton of M -theory obviously cannot wrap around the $\mathbf{S}^1$ and correspond to $D0$ -branes of the IIA theory. Finally, we have the $D6$ -brane, whose field strength is dual to that of the $D0$ -brane and the $D8$ -brane which may be viewed as a source for the dilaton field [14].²

²Non-string theorists may be interested to note that the p -brane spectrum of a theory may simply be read off

To summarise, the brane gas we are interested in contains D -branes of even dimension 0, 2, 4, 6 and 8, and odd dimensional p -branes with $p = 1, 5$. Therefore, the total action governing the dynamics of the system is the background action (equation (1.5)) plus the action describing the fluctuations of all the branes in the theory.

The action of an individual p -brane is the Dirac-Born-Infeld action [15]

$$S_p = T_p \int d^{p+1} \zeta e^{-\Phi} \sqrt{-\det(g_{mn} + b_{mn} + 2\pi\alpha' F_{mn})} \quad (1.7)$$

where

$$T_p = \frac{\pi}{g_s} (4\pi^2 \alpha')^{-(p+1)/2}, \quad (1.8)$$

is the tension of the brane, g_{mn} is the induced metric on the brane, b_{mn} is the induced antisymmetric tensor field, and F_{mn} is the field strength tensor of gauge fields A_m living on the brane.³ The constant $\alpha' \sim l_{st}^2$ is given by the string length scale l_{st} , and g_s is the string coupling parameter. The total action is the sum of the bulk action (1.5) and the sum of all of the brane actions (1.7), each coupled as a delta function source (a delta function in the directions transverse to the brane) to the 10-dimensional action.

The induced metric on the brane g_{mn} , with indices $m, n, \dots$ denoting space-time dimensions parallel to the brane, is determined by the background metric $G_{\mu\nu}$ and by scalar fields ϕ_i living on the brane (with indices $i, j, \dots$ denoting dimensions transverse to the brane) which describe the fluctuations of the brane in the transverse directions:

$$g_{mn} = G_{mn} + G_{ij} \partial_m \phi_i \partial_n \phi_j + G_{in} \partial_m \phi_i. \quad (1.9)$$

The induced antisymmetric tensor field is

$$b_{mn} = B_{mn} + B_{ij} \partial_m \phi_i \partial_n \phi_j + B_{i[n} \partial_m \phi_{i]}. \quad (1.10)$$

from the supersymmetry charges $Z_{\mu_1}, \dots, Z_{\mu_p}$ present in the theory. From the algebras (1.4) and (1.6) we can easily identify the p -branes of eleven-dimensional supergravity and Type IIA superstring theory respectively. The dual q -branes of the p -branes are found using the relation $p + q = D - 4$. For example, in ten-dimensions the dual of the electrically charged 0-brane is the magnetically charged 6-brane.

³From equation (1.8) we see that all of the branes in this scenario have *positive* tensions.

In addition,

$$F_{mn} = \partial_{[m} A_{n]}. \quad (1.11)$$

The evolution of the system described above, with Friedman-Robertson-Walker background $G_{\mu\nu} = a(\eta)^2 \text{diag}(-1, 1, \dots, 1)$, was analyzed in [1] and discussed in greater detail in [2]. The results were that the winding p -branes introduced a confining potential for the scale factor $a(\eta)$ implying that these states tend to *prevent* the universe from expanding [1, 16].

A summary of the evolution of the universe according to the Brane Gas model is the following. The universe starts out small, hot and dense, toroidal in all nine-spatial dimensions and filled with a gas of p -branes. The p -branes exhibit various behaviors. They may wrap around the cycles of the torus (winding modes), they can have a center-of-mass motion along the cycles (momentum modes) or they may simply fluctuate in the bulk space (oscillatory modes). By symmetry, we assume that there are equal numbers of winding and anti-winding modes. When a winding mode and an anti-winding mode interact they unwind and form a loop in the bulk spacetime. As the universe tries to expand, the winding modes become heavy and halt the expansion. Spatial dimensions can only dynamically decompactify if the winding modes disappear.

A simple counting argument demonstrates that a p -brane winding mode and a p -brane anti-winding mode are likely to interact in at most $2p + 1$ dimensions.⁴ In $d = 9$ spatial dimensions, there are no obstacles preventing the disappearance of $p = 8, 6, 5$ and $p = 4$ winding modes, whereas the lower dimensional brane winding modes will allow a hierarchy of dimensions to become large.

For volumes large compared to the string volume, the p -branes with the largest value of p carry the most energy (see equation (2.24)), and therefore they will have an important effect first. The 2-branes will unwind in $2(2) + 1 = 5$ spatial dimensions allowing these dimensions to become large. Within this distinguished $\mathbf{T}^5$, the 1-brane winding modes will only allow a $\mathbf{T}^3$ subspace to become large. Hence the above model provides a dynamical decompactification mechanism which results in a macroscopic, 3-dimensional universe, potentially solving the dimensionality problem discussed

⁴For example, consider two particles (0-branes) moving through a space of dimension d . These particles will definitely interact (assuming the space is periodic) if $d = 1$, whereas they probably will not find each other in a space with $d > 1$.

in section 1.1.

We have reiterated the general arguments of [1] in order to point out the special way in which the dimensional hierarchy is made manifest. This decomposition into products of spaces exhibiting these particular dimensionalities will be of interest to us in the following sections. A careful counting of dimensions leads to the resulting manifold

$$\mathcal{M}_{IIA}^{10} = \mathbf{S}^1 \times \mathbf{T}^4 \times \mathbf{T}^2 \times \mathbf{T}^3, \quad (1.12)$$

where the $\mathbf{S}^1$ comes from the original compactification of M -theory and the hierarchy of tori are generated by the self-annihilation of $p = 2$ and $p = 1$ branes as described above.

Note that the compact dimensions remain compact due to remnant winding states. For example, the $\mathbf{T}^2$ remains small due to string winding modes which cannot self-annihilate once the $\mathbf{T}^3$ has grown large. (These remnant winding modes have coordinates in the large $\mathbf{T}^3$ as well.) However, one issue which remains a concern is the stability of the radius of the compact dimensions to inhomogeneities as a function of the three coordinates x_i ; $i = 1, 2, 3$ corresponding to the large spatial dimensions. The separation in x_i between the branes wrapping the small tori is increasing, and there appears to be no mechanism to keep the “internal” dimensions from expanding inhomogeneously in x_i *between* the branes. A simple but unsatisfactory solution, is to invoke a non-perturbative effect similar to what is needed to stabilize the dilaton at late times, namely to postulate a potential which will stabilize the moduli uniformly in x_i (after the winding modes around the x_i directions have disappeared). Work on a possible solution within the context of the framework presented here is in progress.⁵

From equation (1.12) it appears that the universe may have undergone a phase during which physics was described by an effective six-dimensional theory. It is tempting to draw a relation between this theory and the scenario of [17, 18]. However, since the only scale in the theory is the string scale it seems unlikely that the extra dimensions are large enough to solve the hierarchy problem. This will be studied in a future publication.

⁵We thank R. Brandenberger and D. Lowe for discussions on this issue.

2 Brane gases on $K3$ and Calabi-Yau manifolds

The greatest deficiency of the brane gas model is its current lack of contact with particle physics. Part of this problem is the fact that the compactification was carried out on a toroidal manifold which possesses trivial holonomy. Because of this it is impossible to reproduce a realistic model of particle physics (consistent with string theory), and hence the resulting cosmological model cannot be a realistic one. We will now try to generalise the model of brane gas cosmology to $K3$ and, via duality, to Calabi-Yau three-folds.

2.1 Brane gases and heterotic $E_8 \times E_8$ strings

The cosmological scenario of [1] was developed within the context of M -theory on $\mathbf{S}^1$ which gives Type IIA superstring theory in ten-dimensions. Let us begin by considering the same scenario in a different branch of the M -theory moduli space, one which is more easily connected to realistic particle physics, the $E_8 \times E_8$ heterotic string theory. Like the Type IIA string, the $E_8 \times E_8$ theory can be obtained directly from eleven-dimensional M -theory [27]. The specific conjecture is that strongly coupled $E_8 \times E_8$ heterotic superstring theory is equivalent to M -theory on the orbifold $\mathbf{S}^1/\mathbf{Z}_2 \times \mathbf{R}^{10}$ [27].

To maintain the initial conditions of [1], we will assume that the nine-spatial dimensions are periodically identified so that the full ten-dimensional spatial manifold is

$$\mathcal{M}_{het}^{10} = \mathbf{S}^1/\mathbf{Z}_2 \times \mathbf{T}^9, \quad (2.13)$$

where the $\mathbf{S}^1/\mathbf{Z}_2$ is from the initial compactification of eleven-dimensional M -theory. The ten-dimensional low energy effective action is

$$S_{het}(g, A, \Phi, \dots) = \frac{1}{2\kappa^2} \int d^{10}x \sqrt{-g} e^{-2\Phi} \left[R(g) + 4(\nabla\Phi)^2 - \frac{1}{3}H^2 + \frac{\alpha'}{30} \text{Tr} F_A^2 + \dots \right], \quad (2.14)$$

for a metric g of signature $(-, +, \dots, +)$, a connection A and the dilaton Φ . The fields denoted by the “...” have been omitted due to their irrelevance to the current topic of interest. They include the supersymmetric partners of the fields listed, for example; the dilatino, the gravitino and the gaugino.

Among the fundamental constituents of the heterotic theory are 2-dimensional objects (from the $M2$ -brane in the eleven-dimensional theory) and strings. As described in section 1.2, these $p = 2$ and $p = 1$ dimensional objects will be the only winding modes which are important for the decompactification of a nine-dimensional space. The hierarchy in the sizes of the growing dimensions, will therefore be the same as that presented in section 1.2 formulated within the context of Type IIA string theory (see equation (1.12)). The entire ten-dimensional manifold decomposes into

$$\mathcal{M}_{het}^{10} = \mathbf{S}^1/\mathbf{Z}_2 \times \mathbf{T}^4 \times \mathbf{T}^2 \times \mathbf{T}^3. \quad (2.15)$$

Note, that *before* the string winding modes have annihilated the space will look like $\mathcal{M}^{10} = \mathbf{S}^1/\mathbf{Z}_2 \times \mathbf{T}^4 \times \mathbf{T}^5$ which may be approximated by the heterotic $E_8 \times E_8$ theory compactified on $\mathbf{T}^4$. Let us take a moment to examine this theory in more detail.

2.1.1 Heterotic $E_8 \times E_8$ on $\mathbf{T}^4$

The six-dimensional heterotic theory, achieved by dimensional reduction of the action (2.14), is

$$S_{\mathbf{T}^4}^{het} = \frac{1}{2\kappa_6^2} \int d^6x \sqrt{-g_6} e^{-2\Phi_6} \left[R + 4(\nabla\Phi)^2 - \frac{1}{2}|\tilde{H}_3|^2 - \frac{\kappa_6^2}{2g_6^2}|F_2^2| \right], \quad (2.16)$$

where the six-dimensional dilaton is dependent on the internal space volume and Φ :⁶

$$e^{-2\Phi_6} = V e^{-2\Phi}. \quad (2.17)$$

The resulting theory is an $\mathcal{N} = 2$, non-chiral theory.

The decomposition of equation (2.15) is nearly identical to the decomposition of $\mathcal{M}_{IIA}^{10}$ in equation (1.12). Considering these similarities, one is tempted to suspect a relation between the two superstring theories, Type IIA and heterotic $E_8 \times E_8$. Of course, such a duality exists and is well known [12, 28]. Let us return to this issue after briefly introducing the surface $K3$ which will play a key role in our discussion of duality.

⁶Here we use the notation of [14].

2.1.2 $K3$ surfaces

There are only two Ricci-flat, Kähler manifolds in four-dimensions. One we have already discussed is the torus $\mathbf{T}^4$ and the other is the surface $K3$.⁷ The surface $K3$ is a Calabi-Yau manifold but it has only two complex dimensions ($d = 4$ real dimensions) and $SU(2)$ holonomy. This surface has appeared extensively in the literature and plays a paramount role in the analysis of string duality symmetries. An extensive introduction to the properties of $K3$ can be found in [23].

Although no explicit construction of the metric on $K3$ has been found [24], it is possible to construct the manifold from an orbifold of $\mathbf{T}^4$ [25]. One starts by identifying coordinates of $\mathbf{T}^4$, $x^i \sim x^i + 2\pi$ and then making the identification $x^i \sim -x^i$, where $x^i \in \mathbf{R}^4$. This will lead to 16 fixed points located at $x^i = \pi n$, where $n \in \mathbf{Z}$. By removing the points as four-spheres and then filling the 16 resulting holes with four-dimensional Eguchi-Hanson instantons, it is possible to achieve an approximation to the smooth Ricci-flat $K3$ manifold.⁸ This approximation becomes more and more precise in the limit as the radius of the instantons approaches zero [26]. For the purposes of this paper we may consider $K3$ as

$$K3 \simeq \mathbf{T}^4/\mathbf{Z}_2. \quad (2.18)$$

2.1.3 Heterotic $E_8 \times E_8$ and Type IIA

Now consider “moving” the $\mathbf{Z}_2$ symmetry in equation (2.15) from the $\mathbf{S}^1$ to the $\mathbf{T}^4$. We then have the structure

$$\mathcal{M}^{10} = \mathbf{S}^1 \times \mathbf{T}^4/\mathbf{Z}_2 \times \mathbf{T}^2 \times \mathbf{T}^3. \quad (2.19)$$

From the full, eleven-dimensional perspective the equation (2.19) looks like M -theory compactified on $\mathbf{S}^1 \times K3$ (recall equation (2.18)), which is Type IIA string theory compactified on $K3$. In fact, this *gives* the duality between this theory and the one presented in section 2.1.1.

Type IIA superstring theory compactified on $K3$ is dual to heterotic $E_8 \times E_8$ superstring theory compactified on $\mathbf{T}^4$ [12, 28]. The duality seems almost obvious when one considers the manifolds

⁷By “surface” we mean two complex dimensions.

⁸Note that any two $K3$ ’s are diffeomorphic to each other, and therefore we can produce all of the topological invariants of $K3$ from just one example.

(2.19) and (2.15), and recalls the ability of $K3$ compactifications to break supersymmetry. Because the heterotic theory has less supersymmetry than the IIA theory, some of the supersymmetries of the IIA theory must be broken before any identification between the two theories can be made. A $\mathbf{T}^4$ compactification of the IIA theory is a $\mathcal{N} = 4$ theory. As discussed above, the properties of $K3$ reduce the supersymmetry of the compactified IIA theory down to $\mathcal{N} = 2$, which is the number of supersymmetries in the theory obtained by compactification of the heterotic string on $\mathbf{T}^4$.

These cosmological considerations seem to provide further evidence for the conjectured duality. To make this equivalence more transparent let us consider the theory obtained from compactification of Type IIA on $K3$, and then compare this to our analysis of the heterotic string on $\mathbf{T}^4$ (section 2.1.1).

2.2 Type IIA on $K3$

The simplest compactification to four-dimensions other than the torus is the surface $K3$ (having $SU(2)$ holonomy) along with a cartesian product of $\mathbf{T}^2$. We have mentioned that $K3$ is a very special surface within the context of string theory. In the next few sections we continue to investigate the interesting physics that arises in $K3$ compactifications and consider some of the implications this surface has on string cosmology.

Our first obstacle to generalising the brane gas model of cosmology to $K3$ and Calabi-Yau spaces is the absence of one-cycles on both of these objects.⁹ At first glance the arguments of [1] seem to rely on the presence of one-cycles in the compactified dimensions. We will show that a more careful consideration demonstrates that this is not necessarily the case.

The reduction of Type IIA theory on $K3$, which is suggested by the equation (2.19), leads to the following action

$$S_{K3}^{IIA} = \frac{1}{2\kappa_6^2} \int d^6x \sqrt{-g_6} e^{-2\Phi_6} \left[R + 4(\nabla\Phi)^2 - \frac{1}{2}e^{2\Phi_6} |\tilde{H}_3|^2 - \frac{\kappa_6^2}{2g_6^2} |F_2^2| \right]. \quad (2.20)$$

⁹For $K3$ surfaces and phenomenologically interesting Calabi-Yau spaces the first Betti number vanishes, $b_1 = 0$ (see e.g. [23, 20]).

Notice that this action can be transformed into (2.16) by the conformal transformation

$$g_{\mu\nu} \rightarrow e^{2\Phi_6} g_{\mu\nu}, \quad (2.21)$$

along with the reflection

$$\Phi_6 \rightarrow -\Phi_6. \quad (2.22)$$

Here, $\tilde{H}_3 \rightarrow e^{2\Phi_6} *_6 \tilde{H}_3$, where $*_6$ results from the factorization of the ten-dimensional $*$ by $*_{10} = *_6 *_4$ [14]. Because of the identification of $\Phi_6 \rightarrow -\Phi_6$, the conjectured duality maps a strongly coupled theory to a weakly coupled theory.

The IIA theory on $K3$ contains the IIA string formed by the wrapping of $M2$ -branes on the $\mathbf{S}^1$ from the compactification of M -theory (as described in section 1.2). There is another string in this theory however, obtained by wrapping an $M5$ -branes around the entire four-dimensional $K3$. This is exactly the heterotic string [30].

The two theories (2.20) and (2.16) have the same low energy supergravity description [28], which is an $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supergravity coupled to abelian super-Yang-Mills multiplets. This results in 80 scalar fields which span the moduli space of vacua.¹⁰

2.2.1 IIA brane gas on $K3$

Let us consider a simple modification to the brane gas model summarised in section 1.2. The background will be M -theory on the manifold

$$\mathcal{M} = \mathbf{S}^1 \times K3 \times \mathbf{T}^5, \quad (2.23)$$

or Type IIA string theory in a toroidal universe, compactified on $K3$. The gas of branes are the branes of the Type IIA theory.

Recall that string winding modes will act like rubber bands wrapped around the cycles of the toroidal universe and hence, their existence tends to prevent the universe from expanding. Branes of larger dimension (greater values of p) have a similar behavior as we demonstrate below, but the

¹⁰At first glance, one may be concerned that the Type IIA theory lacks the $E_8 \times E_8$ Yang-Mills fields of the heterotic string. This is not a problem however, since the moduli space of the IIA theory is enhanced via the compactification onto $K3$, and the resulting theory has the expected 80 scalar fields mentioned above [20, 23].

energies in these branes is greater than the energy in the string winding modes, and therefore they have an important effect on the dynamics of the universe first. We will show that such winding branes may wrap around cycles of $K3$ and prevent it from expanding.

The energy of a p -brane winding mode in an FRW universe with scale factor $a(\eta)$ can be calculated from the action (1.7), and is given by

$$E_p(a) \simeq T_p a(\eta)^p, \quad (2.24)$$

where η is conformal time and T_p is the tension of the p -brane given by equation (1.8). From this we see that the energy of a p -brane winding mode increases with p . The ratio of the energy in a $(p+1)$ -brane winding mode to a p -brane winding mode in this background is

$$\frac{E_{(p+1)}}{E_p} \simeq (4\pi^2 \alpha')^{-1/2} a(\eta). \quad (2.25)$$

Note that there is no p dependence in this equation. Equation (2.24) is the energy of a p -brane wrapped around a one-cycle. This is the correct expression to use when calculating the energy in winding modes wrapped around the toroidal pieces of the manifold $\mathcal{M}$ in equation (2.23).

We have mentioned above that $K3$ does not possess one-cycles and therefore strings cannot wrap around this portion of the manifold and prevent it from expanding. However, $K3$ does have Betti number $b_2 = 22$ (twenty-two harmonic two-forms) and therefore contains 22 two-cycles, which $p > 1$ branes can wrap around. Note that the torus $\mathbf{T}^5$ also contains ($b_2 = 10$) two cycles.

For our cosmological considerations we take the initial state of the universe to be the same as that described in section 1.2, except for the topology of the space which is now given by (in the $D = 10$ dimensional string description) $K3 \times \mathbf{T}^5$. Recall that the highest dimensional brane winding modes have an effect on the dynamics first, since they have the largest energy and therefore fall out of equilibrium first. As described in section 1.2, brane winding modes for $p = 8, 6, 5, 4$ branes do not have an effect on the decompactification process. The first branes to have an effect are the 2-brane winding modes. However, we shall assume that the 2-branes which are wrapped around the two-cycles of the $\mathbf{T}^5$ are heavier than the 2-branes which are wrapped around the two-cycles of the $K3$; hence, they will fall out of thermal equilibrium and consequently effect the dynamics of the

decompactification first. A plausibility argument for this assumption goes as follows: recall that the energy of a membrane scales with its area. Now let us consider the topological structure of the two-cycles of $K3$ and $\mathbf{T}^5$. A theorem familiar to many mathematicians states that any compact connected surface with boundary is topologically equivalent to a sphere ($\mathbf{S}^2$), the connected sum of n tori ($\mathbf{T}^2 \# \cdots \# \mathbf{T}^2$), or the connected sum of n projective planes ($\mathbf{RP}^2 \# \cdots \# \mathbf{RP}^2$), with a finite number of discs removed.¹¹ Therefore, the two-cycles under consideration must have one of the above mentioned topological structures. Since neither $K3$ nor $\mathbf{T}^5$ contain a möbius band, we may rule out any topological structure containing the real projective plane $\mathbf{RP}^2$ which is non-orientable.

Let us first consider the topology of the two-cycles in $\mathbf{T}^5$. The easiest way to determine their topological structure is to consider the elementary case of $\mathbf{T}^2$. In the torus, there is only $b_2(\mathbf{T}^2) = 1$ two-cycle. Clearly, this two-cycle is just the entire $\mathbf{T}^2$. Note that this two-cycle is made up of $b_1(\mathbf{T}^2) = 2$ one-cycles. From this we can easily generalize to the case of $\mathbf{T}^5$, by considering the number of ways the $\mathbf{S}^1$'s in $\mathbf{T}^5$ can hook up to form two-cycles. There are five $\mathbf{S}^1$'s in $\mathbf{T}^5$ and hence ${}_5C_2 = 10$ *toroidal* two-cycles in the space. Because this agrees with the calculation of the Betti number $b_2(\mathbf{T}^5) = 10$, we know we have taken into account all of the two-cycles.

Now consider the two-cycles in $K3$. Since $K3$ has no one-cycles ($b_1(K3) = 0$) and hence no $\mathbf{S}^1$'s, it is impossible for the two-cycles in $K3$ to have $\mathbf{T}^2 = \mathbf{S}^1 \times \mathbf{S}^1$ topology. Hence the $b_2 = 22$ two-cycles in $K3$ must be topologically equivalent to *spheres*. Because the two-cycles of $K3$ and $\mathbf{T}^5$ differ in their topological structure membranes will have to wrap differently on the distinct types of two-cycles of the product manifold $K3 \times \mathbf{T}^5$.

Recall in the initial conditions of our cosmological model we assumed all radii r_i start out on equal footing, near the string length scale $r_i \approx R_{st}$, where $i = 1, \dots, 9$. A membrane wrapped around a spherical two-cycle in the $K3$ subspace will have energy proportional to its surface area $\mathcal{E}_{S^2} \propto 4\pi R_{st}^2$. The same membrane wrapped around a toroidal two-cycle of the $\mathbf{T}^5$ would have energy $\mathcal{E}_{T^2} \propto 4\pi^2 R_{st}^2$. Hence, the two-branes wrapped around two-cycles of the $\mathbf{T}^5$ will (on average)

¹¹For readers not familiar with the term, the *connected sum* of the surfaces S_1 and S_2 is defined by removing a small disc from each of S_1 and S_2 , and gluing the boundary circles of these discs together to form a new surface $S_1 \# S_2$.

be heavier than the two-branes wrapped around two-cycles of the $K3$ by a factor of π .

In short, for a 2-brane in the space $K3 \times \mathbf{T}^5$ it is energetically more favorable to wrap around one of the 22 two-cycles of the $K3$ than to wrap around one of the 10 two-cycles of the $\mathbf{T}^5$ (when all radii are equal). We come to the conclusion that it is probable that the wrapped 2-branes on $\mathbf{T}^5$ will fall out of thermal equilibrium before the wrapped 2-branes on $K3$ and allow the $\mathbf{T}^5$ to grow. This argument is only a plausibility argument due to our assumptions about initial conditions and setting all radii to be near the string scale. However, we believe that such initial conditions are well motivated given the cosmological setting of [1].

One possibility then (arguably the most probable and certainly the most desirable from the viewpoint of a realistic model) is that the interaction of winding and antiwinding 2-branes causes the $\mathbf{T}^5$ subspace to grow (since $2(2) + 1 = 5$).¹² After that, there is no way for the 2-branes wrapping the $K3$ space to self-annihilate (by the old dimension counting argument) since these branes have coordinates (fluctuations) in the $\mathbf{T}^5$ space as well as in the $K3$. This compact space remains small due to these remnant winding states.¹³ Within the $\mathbf{T}^5$ the string winding mode self-annihilation causes a $\mathbf{T}^3$ torus to grow large. The final result (nearly the same as in the $\mathbf{T}^9$ compactification of section 1.2) is,

$$\mathcal{M}^9 = K3 \times \mathbf{T}^2 \times \mathbf{T}^3. \quad (2.26)$$

The winding modes around the $\mathbf{T}^3$ completely vanish [2] and hence the $\mathbf{T}^3$ topology now looks like $\mathbf{R}^3$. The $\mathbf{T}^2$ remains small due to remnant string winding modes which cannot self-annihilate once the $\mathbf{T}^3$ has grown large. (Note that these winding modes have coordinates in the large $\mathbf{T}^3$ as well.) Because there is only one scale in the theory (the string scale) it seems unlikely that the $\mathbf{T}^2$ subspace will be much larger than the $K3$ space. In fact, the remnant winding states may cause the $\mathbf{T}^2$ to shrink back down to the string scale. This implies that the four-dimensional theory is Type IIA string theory compactified on $K3 \times \mathbf{T}^2$.¹⁴

¹² In order to get a very large gauge group, e.g. $E_8 \times E_8 \times SU(2)^4 \times U(1)^4$ it is probably necessary for the $K3$ space to be very small (with volume of order one in units of $(\alpha')^2$) and singular [23].

¹³ Note that similar arguments should apply to Calabi-Yau threefolds.

¹⁴ A full treatment of the IIA string theory compactified on $K3 \times \mathbf{T}^2$ is given in [31]. A detailed analysis of the six-

In this theory, branes with $p < 5$ can wrap around the two-cycles of the $K3$, producing monopole winding states on $\mathbf{T}^2$. The final four-dimensional field theory has $\mathcal{N} = 4$ supersymmetry and is identical to the low-energy field theory description of the heterotic string on $\mathbf{T}^6$ [28].

The $K3$ compactification of IIA string theory presented above is an improvement over the trivial toroidal compactification of [1], in the sense that $K3$ has holonomy $SU(2)$ and we have reduced the number of supersymmetries by half (from $\mathcal{N} = 8$ to $\mathcal{N} = 4$). Of course, the only physically relevant case is that of $D = 4$, $\mathcal{N} = 1$. Alas, we do not construct such a theory in this paper but we will produce a $D = 4$, $\mathcal{N} = 2$ theory in what follows.

2.2.2 $E_8 \times E_8$ brane gas on $K3$

One way to get an $\mathcal{N} = 2$ theory in four-dimensions is to compactify the heterotic $E_8 \times E_8$ string on a complex three-fold with $SU(2)$ holonomy. All such manifolds are of the form $K3 \times \mathbf{T}^2$ (and its quotients) [23]. Once again, we find that a brane gas within the context of heterotic string theory on a nine-dimensional manifold $K3 \times \mathbf{T}^5$, is governed by the same arguments presented in section 1.2 (also see section 2.1.3). The symmetry group decomposes as

$$SO(1, 9) \supset SO(1, 5) + SO(4) \simeq SO(1, 5) + SU(2) + SU(2), \quad (2.27)$$

and we have an $\mathcal{N} = 1$ theory in six-dimensions. The 2-branes allow the $\mathbf{T}^5$ submanifold to grow and then within the $\mathbf{T}^5$ the strings allow a $\mathbf{T}^3$ space to grow large. From the $D = 11$ M -theory point of view, the full $d = 10$ manifold is

$$\mathcal{M}_{het\ on\ K3}^{10} = \mathbf{S}^1/\mathbf{Z}_2 \times K3 \times \mathbf{T}^2 \times \mathbf{T}^3, \quad (2.28)$$

which gives an $\mathcal{N} = 2$ theory in $D = 4$.

2.3 Brane gases on Calabi-Yau manifolds

A realistic construction of our universe based on superstring theory requires compactification onto spaces of nontrivial topology. If one chooses to compactify on a manifold, then particle physics dimensional theory which describes this shrinking $\mathbf{T}^5$ fracturing into an expanding $\mathbf{T}^3$ and shrinking $\mathbf{T}^2$ is underway. It appears that the $\mathbf{T}^3$ space makes a graceful exit from a contracting phase into an expanding phase, perhaps along the lines of [32].

requires that this be a Calabi-Yau threefold $\mathbf{X}$.¹⁵

The first difficulty we encounter when considering Brane Gas Cosmology and Calabi-Yau compactifications with $SU(3)$ holonomy is the absence of one-cycles in $\mathbf{X}$ ($b_1(\mathbf{X}) = 0$). In general, such manifolds do have higher dimensional p -cycles, and we may employ the same arguments given in our discussion of $K3$ to show that the absence of one-cycles may not pose a problem for the cosmological model (see section 2.2.1).

In fact, some properties of Calabi-Yau three-folds are easier to understand within our context than the $K3$ surface. In a Calabi-Yau three-fold $\mathbf{X}$ the Kähler moduli parameterize the relative resizing of the two-cycles (and the four-dimensional subspaces representing their dual four-cycles). Thus the Kähler moduli give the overall scale of the manifold; i.e. fluctuations of these moduli correspond to fluctuations in the volume of the space. Deformations of the complex structure moduli correspond to changing the “shape” of the manifold [22].

For $d = 3$ complex manifolds with exactly $SU(3)$ holonomy, the fermion zero modes (which are harmonic $(0, n)$ forms) must be covariantly constant. This implies vanishing of the Hodge numbers $h^{2,0} = h^{0,2} = 0$. If this condition is satisfied then the entire moduli structure of $\mathbf{X}$ becomes a local product of the complex structure moduli and the Kähler moduli. Deformations in these two types of structure moduli may then be studied independently. In the complex two-fold $K3$, $h^{2,0} = 1$. The complex and Kähler moduli are degenerate and deformations of these structures must be studied simultaneously [29].

The product structure of the moduli on $\mathbf{X}$ may simplify our study considerably. For example, if we choose $\mathbf{X}$ with only one Kähler class then all even dimensional submanifolds in $\mathbf{X}$ will scale with a *single* parameter (or the appropriate power thereof). We may imagine then the possibility of constraining only one two-cycle (perhaps with a winding brane) and thereby “fix” all other two-cycles in $\mathbf{X}$.¹⁶

The second difficulty (which will prevent us from achieving a realistic $N = 1$, $D = 4$ cosmological

¹⁵If one is willing to allow the compactified space to have singularities then it is possible to generate realistic particle physics models from orbifold compactifications.

¹⁶We thank B. Greene for pointing this out. After the completion of this work a related paper appeared in [36].

theory) is that it is not clear how the manifold $\mathcal{M}^9$, resulting from a direct compactification on $\mathbf{X}$, will decompose. Within the context of the brane gas model, all the manifolds $\mathcal{M}_i$ decompose into products of a space and a five-dimensional torus due to the 2-brane winding modes (see, for example equation (2.23)). In the case of a direct compactification onto $\mathbf{X}$, the full ten-dimensional manifold is

$$\mathcal{M} = \mathbf{M}^1 \times \mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{T}^3, \quad (2.29)$$

where $\mathbf{M}^1$ is either $\mathbf{S}^1$ (for the Type IIA theory) or $\mathbf{S}^1/\mathbf{Z}_2$ (for the $E_8 \times E_8$ heterotic string). It is not clear what the five-dimensional subspace (analogous to the $\mathbf{T}^5$ mentioned above) will be.

Despite this dilemma, there is good reason to believe that such a compactification should somehow be compatible with the brane gas picture. The motivation for this belief results from our lessons about dual $\mathcal{N} = 4$ theories presented in section 2.2.1.

2.3.1 IIA brane gas on a Calabi-Yau threefold

In addition to the discussion of section 2.2.2, a second way to construct an $\mathcal{N} = 2$ theory in $D = 4$ is to consider a Type II theory compactified on a Calabi Yau three-fold $\mathbf{X}$, which is a complex manifold with holonomy $SU(3)$. In this section we will provide an existence proof of the compatibility of Calabi-Yau manifolds and the model of Brane Gas Cosmology.

We would like to find a duality between the $\mathcal{N} = 2$ theories described here, and in section 2.2.2. Such a duality exists [33, 34]: for a certain type of Calabi-Yau three-fold $\mathbf{X}$ with $SU(3)$ holonomy, Type II theories compactified on $\mathbf{X}$ are dual to heterotic $E_8 \times E_8$ on $K3 \times \mathbf{T}^2$.

We will not investigate this duality in detail and the interested reader should see, for example [14, 23]. Many Calabi-Yau manifolds are $K3$ fibrations, i.e. locally a product of $K3$ with a two-dimensional manifold. That is, the manifold $\mathbf{X}$ is a fibration where the generic fiber is a $K3$ surface.

In general, the conformal field theories (CFTs) arising from compactifications on Calabi-Yau manifolds have very different geometric descriptions in terms of the Kähler and complex structure

moduli. This brings us to a short discussion of *mirror manifolds* [22].¹⁷ It appears that certain Calabi-Yau manifolds come in mirror pairs, $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{W}$ where the conformal field theory descriptions of the two manifolds are isomorphic (related by $H \rightarrow -H$) but certain geometric properties are reversed. A geometric correspondence between two such manifolds is known for at least one type of such mirror pairs. These are related to so called Gepner models, for which a relation between mirrors is

$$\mathcal{W} = \mathcal{M}/\Gamma, \quad (2.30)$$

where Γ is some subgroup of the global symmetry group that commutes with the spacetime supersymmetry group. This “twisting” by Γ results in orbifold singularities in the mirror space $\mathcal{W}$. Note that in the above compactification of $E_8 \times E_8$ on $K3$, the $K3$ surface is itself a fibration with generic fiber given by a $\mathbf{T}^2$. Because of this duality between IIA on a Calabi-Yau manifold and the heterotic string on $K3 \times \mathbf{T}^2$, we suspect that BGC is compatible with Calabi-Yau compactifications. Specifically, the brane gas cosmology of section 2.2.2 should be dual to a brane gas cosmology on a Calabi-Yau three-fold.

2.4 Type IIB brane gases

The Type IIB theory is a theory with chiral $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supersymmetry. It is not clear how to derive this theory from an eleven-dimensional supergravity theory and therefore its connection to M -theory is not as transparent as that of the Type IIA and heterotic theories. Nevertheless, the Type IIB theory occupies a space in the M -theory moduli space, and therefore we should consider BGC within the context of the IIB theory.

For simplicity and to make a comparison with [1] we consider the IIB brane gas in a toroidal background $\mathbf{T}^9$. However, our general statements concerning IIA on $K3$ also apply to the IIB theory. The algebra for the Type IIB superstring, which has two chiral spinors Q_α^i is

$$\begin{aligned} \{Q_\alpha^i, Q_\beta^j\} = & \delta^{ij}(\mathcal{P}\Gamma^M C)_{\alpha\beta} P_M + (\mathcal{P}\Gamma^M C)_{\alpha\beta} \tilde{Z}_M^{ij} + \epsilon^{ij}(\mathcal{P}\Gamma^{MNP} C)_{\alpha\beta} Z_{MNP} \\ & + \delta^{ij}(\mathcal{P}\Gamma^{MNPQR} C)_{\alpha\beta} Z_{MNPQR}^+ + (\mathcal{P}\Gamma^{MNPQR} C)_{\alpha\beta} \tilde{Z}_{MNPQR}^{+ij}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.31)$$

¹⁷Much of our discussion on this subject will “reflect” Polchinski’s book [14].

where $\mathcal{P}$ is a chiral projection operator and the tilde refers to traceless $SO(2)$ tensors [20]. From the algebra we see that this theory contains odd-dimensional BPS states which are Dp -branes with $p = 1, 3, 5, \dots$. Following our usual arguments, we find that the $p = 1$ and $p = 3$ winding branes will have an effect on the decompactification dynamics of the nine-dimensional universe. The 3-branes allow a $\mathbf{T}^7$ subspace to become large and then the string winding modes (as usual) result in a $\mathbf{T}^3$ large sub-subspace. The overall nine-dimensional manifold $\mathcal{M}^9$ evolves into

$$\mathcal{M}_{IIB}^9 = \mathbf{T}^2 \times \mathbf{T}^4 \times \mathbf{T}^3. \quad (2.32)$$

By comparing equation (2.32) with the corresponding decomposition within the context of the IIA theory (1.12), we see the same overall structure except for the switching of the roles of $\mathbf{T}^2$ and $\mathbf{T}^4$ within the scaled hierarchy of large dimensions.

Note, that the IIA string theory compactified on a circle of radius R , is dual to Type IIB string theory compactified on a circle of radius $1/R$ (at the same value of the coupling constant). In some sense, we may actually *see* the effects of T -duality by comparing equation (1.12) and equation (2.32). If we identify one of the $\mathbf{S}^1$'s in the $\mathbf{T}^2$ as the $\mathbf{S}^1$ that is transformed by T -duality, it makes sense that the $\mathbf{T}^2$ of one theory will be of smaller area than the $\mathbf{T}^2$ of the other theory. Of course T -duality alone does not explain why the area of the $\mathbf{T}^2$ in the IIB theory should be smaller than that of the $\mathbf{T}^2$ in the IIA theory. This difference is determined by the brane spectrums of the IIA and IIB gases and the dynamics arising from their respective cosmologies.

The T -duality relation between the Type IIA and Type IIB theories provides an interesting context in which to explore mirror symmetry [14, 35]. Consider the IIA string on a Calabi-Yau manifold $\mathcal{M}$ (section 2.3.1). The manifold of states of a $D0$ -brane make up $\mathcal{M}$ itself, since the $D0$ -brane can live anywhere. Now consider the dual IIB theory on the mirror manifold $\mathcal{W}$. The Dp -branes of the IIB theory can wrap around the non-trivial cycles of $\mathcal{W}$. As we have explained, these will be odd p , p -branes and the Betti numbers of $\mathcal{W}$ have $b_1 = b_5 = 0$, which implies we must have $p = 3$ winding branes. As explained in [14, 35] this suggests a T -duality on three axes. The $D0$ -brane will have three coordinates that map to internal Wilson lines on the $D3$ -brane, which

must therefore be topologically a $\mathbf{T}^3$. Hence $\mathcal{W}$ is a $\mathbf{T}^3$ fibration and the mirror transformation is T -duality on the three axes of $\mathbf{T}^3$. This implies that $\mathcal{M}$ must also be a $\mathbf{T}^3$ fibration.

3 Conclusions

The Brane Gas model of the early universe provides a potential solution to the dimensionality problem, which is a problem of both string theory and cosmology. Previous formulations of the model have failed to incorporate superstring compactifications capable of leading to realistic models of particle physics. We have taken the first steps toward modifying the scenario to accommodate compactifications on spaces with non-trivial holonomy.

Brane gases constructed from various branches of the M -theory moduli space were analyzed. By considering the dynamics of these gases in backgrounds of different topologies, we come to the conclusion that the general properties and successes of the cosmological model introduced in [1] remain intact. In particular, we discussed compactification on manifolds with non-trivial $SU(2)$ and $SU(3)$ holonomy, which correspond to $K3$ and Calabi-Yau three-folds, respectively. Despite the lack of one-cycles around each dimension in these spaces, specific cases exist in which only a three-dimensional subspace can become large (e.g., section 2.2.1).

Superstring duality symmetries become more lucid within this cosmological context. Several examples are given where brane gas models constructed from one sector of the M -theory moduli space are linked to dual models in another. We believe these considerations provide further evidence for the conjectured duality symmetries of string theory.

Finally, we constructed a model of cosmological brane gases from $E_8 \times E_8$ heterotic string theory on $K3 \times \mathbf{T}^2$. This gives an $\mathcal{N} = 2$ theory in four-dimensions, on a manifold with nontrivial homology. Such an example is a significant improvement, from the point of view of particle phenomenology, to the BGC of [1]. Using the power of duality we relate this theory to a brane gas model constructed from Type IIA string theory compactified on a Calabi-Yau three-fold with nontrivial $SU(3)$ holonomy. We argue that this example provides an existence proof of the compatibility between Brane Gas Cosmology and Calabi-Yau compactifications.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank R. Brandenberger for his comments on a draft of this article and for numerous useful discussions. I would also like to thank D. Dooling, R. Easther, B. Greene, M. Grisaru and M. Jackson for helpful discussions and T. Hübsch for enlightening correspondences. This research was supported in part by NSERC (Canada) and FCAR (Québec).

References

- [1] S. Alexander, R. H. Brandenberger and D. Easson, Phys. Rev. D **62**, 103509 (2000) [hep-th/0005212].
- [2] R. Brandenberger, D. A. Easson and D. Kimberly, Nucl. Phys. B **623**, 421 (2002) [arXiv:hep-th/0109165].
- [3] R. H. Brandenberger and C. Vafa, Nucl. Phys. B **316**, 391 (1989).
- [4] C. P. Burgess, M. Majumdar, D. Nolte, F. Quevedo, G. Rajesh and R. J. Zhang, JHEP **0107**, 047 (2001) [arXiv:hep-th/0105204].
- [5] S. H. Alexander, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 023507 (2002) [arXiv:hep-th/0105032].
- [6] S. A. Abel, K. Freese and I. I. Kogan, JHEP **0101**, 039 (2001) [arXiv:hep-th/0005028].
- [7] N. Turok, Phys. Rev. Lett. **60**, 549 (1988).
- [8] W. Nahm, Nucl. Phys. B **135**, 149 (1978).
- [9] P. C. West, arXiv:hep-th/9811101.
- [10] J. E. Lidsey, D. Wands and E. J. Copeland, Phys. Rept. **337**, 343 (2000) [arXiv:hep-th/9909061].
- [11] P. K. Townsend, Phys. Lett. B **350**, 184 (1995) [arXiv:hep-th/9501068].
- [12] E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. B **443**, 85 (1995) [arXiv:hep-th/9503124].
- [13] E. Cremmer, B. Julia and J. Scherk, Phys. Lett. B **76**, 409 (1978).
- [14] J. Polchinski, *Cambridge, UK: Univ. Pr. (1998) 531 p.*
- [15] J. Polchinski, *Cambridge, UK: Univ. Pr. (1998) 402 p.*
- [16] A. A. Tseytlin and C. Vafa, Nucl. Phys. B **372**, 443 (1992) [arXiv:hep-th/9109048].
- [17] N. Arkani-Hamed, S. Dimopoulos and G. R. Dvali, Phys. Lett. B **429**, 263 (1998) [arXiv:hep-ph/9803315].
- [18] I. Antoniadis, N. Arkani-Hamed, S. Dimopoulos and G. R. Dvali, Phys. Lett. B **436**, 257 (1998) [arXiv:hep-ph/9804398].
- [19] P. Horava and E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. B **475**, 94 (1996) [arXiv:hep-th/9603142].

- [20] M. Kaku, *New York, USA: Springer (1999) 587 p.*
- [21] D. A. Easson, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **16**, 4803 (2001) [arXiv:hep-th/0003086].
- [22] B. R. Greene, arXiv:hep-th/9702155.
- [23] P. S. Aspinwall, arXiv:hep-th/9611137.
- [24] S.-T. Yau, *Commun. Pure Appl. Math.* **31**, 339 (1978).
- [25] D. N. Page, *Phys. Lett. B* **80**, 55 (1978).
- [26] H. Lu, C. N. Pope and K. S. Stelle, *Nucl. Phys. B* **548**, 87 (1999) [arXiv:hep-th/9810159].
- [27] P. Horava and E. Witten, *Nucl. Phys. B* **460**, 506 (1996) [arXiv:hep-th/9510209].
- [28] C. M. Hull and P. K. Townsend, *Nucl. Phys. B* **438**, 109 (1995) [arXiv:hep-th/9410167].
- [29] P. S. Aspinwall and D. R. Morrison, arXiv:hep-th/9404151.
- [30] S. Cherkis and J. H. Schwarz, *Phys. Lett. B* **403**, 225 (1997) [arXiv:hep-th/9703062].
- [31] E. Kiritsis, arXiv:hep-th/9709062.
- [32] G. De Risi and M. Gasperini, *Phys. Lett. B* **521**, 335 (2001) [arXiv:hep-th/0109137].
- [33] S. Kachru and C. Vafa, *Nucl. Phys. B* **450**, 69 (1995) [arXiv:hep-th/9505105].
- [34] S. Ferrara, J. A. Harvey, A. Strominger and C. Vafa, *Phys. Lett. B* **361**, 59 (1995) [arXiv:hep-th/9505162].
- [35] A. Strominger, S. T. Yau and E. Zaslow, *Nucl. Phys. B* **479**, 243 (1996) [arXiv:hep-th/9606040].
- [36] R. Easther, B. R. Greene and M. G. Jackson, arXiv:hep-th/0204099.